



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MACKINTOSH'S HISTORY.\*

Sir James need not have made the least apology for giving us an abridged history of England, in three volumes octavo; and we can assure him, moreover, that he takes a great deal of unnecessary trouble, at least in our apprehension, when he draws a comparison between the merits of circumstantial and abridged narrative; with a view to the defence of the latter. "Whatever their comparative difficulty and rank may be," he tells us, "it is certain, that both these sorts of historical composition must always exist; and that they differ too much in their use and nature to allow any rivalry between them. An outline is, at least a useful introduction; it may be more easily accessible to consultation; it may remind the reader of many particulars, which would, otherwise, have lain dormant in his memory; it may contain all the information concerning the affairs of our nation, for which men of other countries, or of very different pursuits, can find place in their minds. A community in a state of such active progress as ours at this moment is, daily rears new bodies of readers, who are impatient of historical ignorance, and have no leisure to compare original authorities, or to study ample compilations. It is fit that their praiseworthy curiosity should be satisfied; and that they should not be doomed to ignorance, because they are unable to acquire learning."

*A propos* of this praiseworthy curiosity of the present generation; we were forcibly impressed, a few days ago, with a passage that occurs in one of Smollet's letters. "You will not be sorry to hear," says this accomplished and ready writer, "that the weekly sale of the history, has increased to above ten thousand, &c." The history here alluded to, was his complete History of England, in four vols. quarto, published originally in weekly numbers; "a work," says Sir Walter Scott, "written with uncommon spirit, and correctness of language; and, besides, one of the greatest exertions of facility of composition, which was ever recorded in the history of literature." The fact speaks volumes against the optimists of the day. Which of our modern popular works have been *diffused* to such an extent as this? With all our increased population, our useful knowledge societies, our praiseworthy curiosity, and our impatience of historical ignorance, we apprehend there is no such demand for popular history in our times. In short, we cannot help having our doubts about the much vaunted superiority of the present over the past age, with respect to the proportion of readers, and the solid nature of the works perused by each.

But we were speaking of abridgments,—it is certain that a great authority condemns them. "As for the corruptions and moths of history, which are epitomes, the use of them deserveth to be banished, as all men of sound judgment have confessed, as those that have fretted and corroded the sound bodies of many excellent histories, and wrought them into base and unprofitable dregs.—(*Advancement of Learning, Book 2.*) But we shall not take, on this subject, the ipse dixit even of Verulamius ipse; and the rather, as we find him in the very next page, recommending, as a national work, a history of England and Scotland, to be "joined in one, for the times past; after the manner of the sacred history, which draweth down the story of the ten tribes, and of

\* History of England, in 3 vols. By the Right Hon. Sir James Mackintosh, M.P. London. Longman and Co.

the two tribes, *as twins together*." The specimen, too, which he has bequeathed us in his Henry the Seventh, is quite enough, if further evidence were wanting, to prove that he knows little or nothing about *this* matter.

What are all histories but abridgments and epitomes? Is it not altogether a purely relative consideration? Those who look with complacency on the ocean of the Augustan history—the Byzantines—and the annals of Muratori, will look upon even "the Decline and Fall" as an abridgment; the readers of Pinnock, on the other hand, will think Gibbon needlessly circumstantial; every thing, in fact, depends upon the class of readers for whom the work is intended. For our own part, we are far from thinking meanly of a History of England, of the present dimensions; being aware that the difficulty of such a compilation is, generally speaking, inversely as the proposed bulk—or, to preserve the mathematical phraseology, the duty of the writer of a history intended to be popular, is to reduce the matter to a minimum of size, while he secures a maximum of pleasure and profit to the reader. The greatest fault of modern historians is their diffuseness—they think proper to fill three-fourths of their books with disquisitions on events, which they deem worthy of expansion, from a mistaken idea that those political discourses constitute an *essential* feature in their works. This is the very extravagance of vanity and want of judgment. The practice requires thorough reformation. If there be any value in facts, let us have them plainly set forth—let them speak for themselves—or, at least, let the historian's remarks be rather of a stimulating, than a surfeiting quality—let them rather lead than load the reader's mind.

The "Scotland" of Sir Walter Scott is a good example of what we would have a popular history to be. It is a spirited, and, at the same time, a graceful, though unadorned performance; it is, besides, eminently trustworthy—a golden virtue in such a work; while the language and style are admirably well adapted to the subject—evenly sustained throughout.

That Sir James Mackintosh has taken a correct view of the task assigned him is beyond a doubt. He states his object to be, to present us simply with "a sketch of memorable events in their proper time and regular succession, with few reasonings and reflections, little other praise or blame than the events themselves excite; and no particulars, but such as either strikingly characterise an age and nation, or bring to light the workings of vigorous and conspicuous minds; or exercise the moral feelings, by the contemplation of heroic virtues, and the repulsion of heinous crimes. In such a work, the greatest virtues of an historian—his love of peace, his love of justice, ~~and~~ his love of those institutions which alone maintain peace and justice—must rather breathe through the general tenour of his narrative, than stand forward in separate propositions, supported by laborious argument. He is disposed, by regard to readers who must be taught as if he taught them not, to abstain from that frequent citation of authorities, which, in larger history, he ought to be anxious to put into the hands of the public, as the only tests of his truth." This is, certainly, a most excellent *carte*—but it attaches no small responsibility to the powers and resources of the caterer. The ability, fidelity, and taste, in fact, of the popular historical writer, must be unlimitedly confided in; his qualifications should be known; and he should stand before the public a fair and candid witness; ready, through ill report and good report, to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but

the truth. Sir James, though long talked of as a candidate for historical fame, has never before been introduced to the world in that capacity. He may want some vouchers, perhaps, in consequence, to satisfy his readers that he is duly qualified to be their dragoman—he steps forward to perform an important office in the business of removing ignorance—and we are justified in inquiring simply, who he is. A most valued friend of ours in London, has gone far to answer this question in the preceding paper; but the subject is so interesting, just at present, that we trust we shall be pardoned for endeavouring to contribute our mite of information. We shall, therefore, offer no further apology, for taking a rapid review of the circumstances of his life.

The right honorable Sir James Mackintosh, knight, ex-recorder of Bombay, and member of parliament for Knaresborough, was born at Dorlish, Inverness, on the 24th of October, 1765. His father, a distinguished clansman of the M'Kintoshes, held a commission in the British military service—and was on active duty at Gibraltar, during the period of his son's early education. From Fortrose, where the boy received his classical initiation, he was removed to king's college, Aberdeen; and here he displayed a more than ordinary degree of talent, in the pursuit of Greek literature, under Leslie; while he acquired a superior distinction for his proficiency in the moral philosophy class, under the celebrated James Dunbar; all his life, indeed, it may be remarked, he has shown a decided partiality for moral science—it is but recently that he has finished a dissertation for the new edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, *simile et secundum* to that of Dugald Stewart. The time at length came, when the young philosopher should choose a profession—though, were it left to himself, so much of an Epicurean was he become—he should never, perhaps, have chosen one. His friends were pleased to make him a physician. He accordingly repaired to Edinburgh, where he had the advantage of hearing the two great masters, Cullen and Black, at that time in the zenith of their fame. Among the students who were the contemporaries and friends of Mackintosh at the Edinburgh school, may be mentioned Beddoes, and Sayers of Norwich, and we believe the present Dr. Haslam of Bethlehem hospital. Yet from these associates and their favourite haunts, he permitted himself to be frequently seduced into the more fascinating society of Wild, and Laing and Gillies: Adam Smith, too, is said to have honoured him with his acquaintance. At length, at the due period, in 1787, he received the doctorate—his thesis on that occasion producing him much eclat: it was, as we recollect, a dissertation on muscular motion—the motto, "*Arcanâ latet non enarrabile fibrâ.*" By the advice and encouragement of his friends, he now proceeded to London, to advance himself as a medical man; he did not succeed in the speculation; but neither does he seem to have taken any measures to attain success. He suffered himself to be led away by his prevailing bias into the bewildering mazes of politics; he entered with avidity into every study, that alone excepted by which he was to live. He neglected medicine, and medicine naturally neglected him. His finances required reinforcement. He betook himself to the press; and it may be mentioned as rather a remarkable circumstance, that his first publication was a pamphlet on the regency question, then the great topic of public interest. The labours of Dr. Mackintosh, however, went for nothing. The production, if it did not "fall still-born from the press," certainly never lived to utter a squeak. But it seems to have affected the author as little as it did the public. He was at this time a gay and lively

young man, and suffered no brooding cares to consume his soul. He set out on a continental tour; visited Leyden; passed through Germany; and made some stay in the French metropolis. It was just the period to become a dupe to the principles of the revolution; he unfortunately yielded himself up a willing convert; and returned much in the character and mood of the man, whom Shakspeare describes as having "no music in his soul." We shall not dwell upon this æra of his life. He married, began to have a family, and became sensible of the necessity of exertion. His father was now dead—the small property that devolved to him could promise him little service in the advancement of his medical prospects; so he consulted both his interest and his inclination in applying himself to the study of the law. He became a student of Lincoln's Inn, and thenceforth "threw physic to the dogs." The circumstances connected with his subsequent career, the publication of the *Vindiciæ Gallicæ*; his change of principles, from being the opponent to become the disciple of Burke; his lectures on international law; his celebrated speech for Peltier; his acceptance of the place in India; his return after seven years' transportation; and his parliamentary conduct ever since—are they not written in the Sketch of him even in this book?

It is so long since Sir James first began to be talked of as an historian—though till the present moment, he has been a historian only to the promise—that we would sometimes almost persuade ourselves we are quite familiar with his merits in this department. We can impute this to nothing else than the opinion we had long since formed of his capabilities—by anticipation; an opinion, however, not very flatteringly confirmed, by a morceau of his which appeared last year in one of the periodicals, (*Keepsake* 1829.) The production to which we allude, purports to be a sketch of Mr. Canning; and in truth contains towards the end, a fair though glowing description of that elegant statesman; but the *tout ensemble* of the piece, is rather a curiosity. It is oddly entitled a "Sketch of a fragment of the history of the nineteenth century;" and then proceeds with a page or two of introductory remarks, most intricately complex, if not absolutely unintelligible; while the sentences are found to be long and sometimes strangely disjointed, forming, on the whole, paragraphs of a sprawling and outré character. It leaves an impression on the reader's mind, that the author must be a very fastidious person—altering and refining and retouching every phrase, until it is scarcely the thing it at first appeared to be. He seems to be unable to divest himself of the feeling that great things are expected from him, and that the eyes of prying literary curiosity are fastened upon him: he is disturbed and distracted by the thought, and becomes more and more annoyed by the consciousness of having delayed so long, that the world is perfectly justified in meeting him, when he comes out, with the cool insensibility of anatomists. He cannot forget the ordeal through which he has to pass before he establishes that character as a historian, to which he is so long known to aspire, and which he confesses to be now the chief object of his expiring ambition. This diffidence or failure of moral courage, however ill founded, begets in him a dislike to the task which was once his choice—he procrastinates, and thinks indolence a luxury. But Sir James, strange as it may sound to some ears, was all his life the same indolent person he is at present. Even the *Vindiciæ Gallicæ* is known to have been the production of intermittent labour: it was written piecemeal, and never seen by the author, as a whole, until it first appeared in print. He was

then surprised, and no wonder, at the goodly though bulky structure he had raised.

Possessed of a mind richly stored with literature and knowledge of almost every description, and endowed with powers capable of illustrating almost any subject, without difficulty or exertion, the mechanical business of transferring his ideas to paper, seems to be the chief cause of his literary life being in a great measure unprolific. He has written articles indeed, in the *Edinburgh Review*, and latterly in the *Foreign Quarterly*:—but the plan of these periodicals exactly suited such a contributor; it was no great labour to one who had been a public lecturer—who is a parliamentary orator—a universal reader—and a great talker—to throw off an essay on any topic suggested in the course of his professional study or recreation; the critical journals can always adapt themselves to chance contributions, if they have but the slightest public interest—as they must always have, coming from such a writer as Sir James; an article, besides, is but a two hour's lecture, and the text or theme may be selected at pleasure. Such is the flexible nature of a modern review—and this reminds us of our duty. We have indulged too long in dissertation, while our impatient reader is eagerly awaiting a specimen of Sir James's own handy work, to which he has so long looked forward with anxiety. We shall proceed without further preface to gratify him: in truth, our perusal of the book has necessarily been so hasty, from the reason assigned upon our covers, that we willingly decline any discussion at present of its merits, and proceed at once to extracts. We shall commence with the disputes between the civil and ecclesiastical power, which, during the twelfth century, shook Europe to its centre:

“ In the year 1162, a promotion occurred which proved the most vexatious event of this reign, and which necessarily withdraws the attention of the historian, as it did that of the actors, from the political relations of England with foreign states; this was the elevation of Becket to the archbishopric of Canterbury. The time had now come in which England was to take her share in that memorable contest between the church and the state which agitated all Christendom for a century; which had shaken Germany and Italy to their foundations; and from which the Capetian kings had hitherto owed their escape to the inconsiderable extent of the territory subject to their sway. Enough has been generally said of the ingenuity and address by which the system of the universal and unlimited monarchy of the Roman pontiff over all Christendom, indirectly extending to civil as well as ecclesiastical affairs, was gradually introduced into the minds of men, through a train of premises seemingly harmless and evident, until it at length broke out into deeds of violence and usurpation, after Gregory VII. had openly avowed it as his issue in all its monstrous magnitude and deformity. To bring the pretensions of that hideous system to trial, it was necessary that a difference should arise on some minor question, in the course of which acts must be done on both sides which would necessarily bring into discussion the nature and consequences of excommunication. This opportunity was supplied by the famous dispute about *investitures*, which relates to the question whether it was lawful for lay sovereigns to invest all prelates with the crosier and the ring, as badges of the fealty and allegiance by which every one of them held from his sovereign the temporalities of the diocese with which he was invested, as in the case of any other fief. Usage varied; law on the subject there was none; opinions differed so widely, that it was hard to find any common principle of reason to which the contending parties could appeal. The most regular and approved form, however, of episcopal election appears to have been, that the clergy and the people of the diocese conjointly chose the bishop, with the knowledge and consent of the emperor; a form of speech which, if not altogether unmeaning, involves in it the necessity of his approval. When, under the last Carolingians, and first Capetians, the church had acquired vast possessions, the bishops became, in virtue of their possessions, vassals of the crown, did homage, and swore fealty to their lord paramount, who, on his part, gave them *investiture* of their possessions

by putting into their hands a crosier and a ring. This ceremony was previous to consecration. It was no longer confined to the emperor, but is owned by the most learned writers of the Roman catholic church to have been long practised by most Christian princes. It grew into a prerogative of the most important nature, as it involved a previous negative on every choice, and in effect amounted to the ecclesiastical patronage of Europe, which was the real object of dispute between the pope, who aimed at being the exclusive possessor of the whole, and the temporal sovereigns, who sought no more than what seemed to be their respective allotments of it. As long as a German sovereign continued to call himself emperor of the Romans, it was natural that he should deem the choice of the bishops of Rome, as, more than that of others, subject to his authority, and dependant upon his approval. On the other hand, the bishops of Rome, who crowned the emperor, pretended that they had a right to withhold their ministry in that solemnity, and thus to invalidate the imperial election. The power of nomination (for such it was) was converted by secular princes, especially in the long minority and distracted reign of the emperor Henry IV. into an indecent and scandalous means of raising money, by setting up for sale at public auction the dignities and benefices of the church. Gregory VII. availed himself of these flagrant corruptions as an opportunity for aggrandising the Roman see. He excommunicated and deposed Henry IV. in 1076. The emperor obtained an absolution from his sentence by sitting at the pope's gate for three days barefooted, and clad in coarse woollen. Under the auspices of Gregory, a council was held at Rome, in 1080, which invalidated all ecclesiastical appointments where the investiture was received from a layman, and denounced the whole vengeance of the church against those who confer or accept such profane titles. Finally, on the 7th March, 1080, he proceeded, in the same assembly, to a measure subversive of every power but his own. A decree was passed, as it should seem, in the name of the sovereign pontiff alone, in which, after a long recital of facts, introduced by a solemn invocation of the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, he deposes Henry from every power regal and imperial, absolves all who had sworn allegiance to him from their oath, and in express words raises Rudolf, duke of Suabia, to the imperial throne. Not long after, Gregory died at Salerno, with words in his mouth which strongly evince that magnanimity and sincerity which shine through his extravagant and mischievous usurpations:—'I have loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore do I die in exile.' The thirty years which followed were crowded with the brief and alternate triumphs of the crosier and the sceptre. At last, in an assembly holden at Worms, in September, 1122, it was agreed between Henry V. and Calixtus II., that the emperor should relinquish the practice of investiture by the ring and cross, as symbols of spiritual power; but that he was entitled to superintend the election of bishops, to decide where it was disputed, and to invest the bishop-elect with the temporalities of his see, by touching him with the sceptre. On the question whether the investiture should precede or follow the consecration the treaty was silent. The treaty disappointed both parties, who aimed at each other's destruction. Hence the long time before they could submit to a compromise, in which, indeed, nothing but the utmost weariness could have obliged them to acquiesce. The civil power, which had been for seventy years battered by the artillery of the Vatican, now made one step in advance; for the treaty, by rendering the sovereign's investiture necessary for ecclesiastics, solemnly pronounced that there is in every community an authority independent, not only of papal but of all ecclesiastical power.

"The controversy respecting *investitures* had considerably agitated England, under William II. and Henry I. The repeated banishments of Anselm, who faithfully and courageously adhered to what he thought the interests of religion as well as the rights of the church, were the rewards and proofs of his virtue.

"Before we take a view of the war between church and state in England, we must for a moment describe its renewal in Italy, the seat of one of the contending authorities, and the prize which was coveted by the other; where it was waged on a greater scale, and attended, if not by more interesting incidents, yet by more memorable effects. After the peace of Worms, the empire and the papacy, worn out by a long and fierce struggle, seemed desirous only of repose. It is one of the most melancholy features of barbaric history, that it generally exhibits those high faculties and that commanding energy which are capable of blessing mankind, as almost invariably employed in oppressing and destroying them. War is the only scene in which it then seemed possible to put them forth, and kings who were not conquerors were commonly slothful, imbecile, or immersed in sensuality. The

elevation of Frederick Barbarossa to the throne gave a new blow to the quiet of Italy and of Germany. He was unanimously chosen king of Germany at Frankfurt on the 5th of March, 1152.

"Frederick may be justly considered as the greatest ruler who had arisen among the Teutonic nations since Charlemagne, whom he resembled in ability for war and civil administration, in respect for knowledge, in some perception of the use and dignity of legislation, and in the variety of matters, as well as the multitude of remote and unlike territories in which he employed the unwearied vigour of his mind and body. His first object was to acquire a real authority in Italy, of which law-yers and treaties styled him the sovereign. The two grand obstacles to his purpose were the pope, who needed his help but dreaded a powerful deliverer, and the towns of Upper Italy, which having subdued the petty tyrants in their neighbourhood, without throwing off all nominal connection with the empire, had revived the spirit and prosperity, and promised once more to exhibit the mental power as well as the outward wealth of the Grecian republics. Frederick vanquished the towns, and razed Milan to the ground. After delivering Adrian IV. from the republic of Rome, and putting into his hands Arnold of Brescia, the disciple of Abelard, who had restored the ancient names, at least, of Roman liberty, and whom the unrelenting cruelty of cowardice instantly destroyed by the flames, Frederick, twice master of the imperial city, was crowned emperor of the Romans in the Capitol. His warfare with the republics was carried on with various success. He supported two *anti-popes* (popes not acknowledged by the party finally victorious,) and was more often the enemy than the friend of the legitimate papacy. At length the emperor, despairing, probably, of the allegiance of cities which revolted as often as his feudal militia necessarily returned from their inroads, and disposed to retain some hold on the attachment of Lombardy by a more magnanimous policy, made peace with the Lombard cities on terms most advantageous to them, though in the form of an edict, issued at a diet of the empire, holden at the city of Constance, on the 24th of June, 1183, specious formalities by which he considered himself as saving from degradation the imperial crown. The substance of this important document, to which the same rank in the public law of Europe was assigned for ages, which afterwards devolved on the treaty of Westphalia, is a grant to the towns of all the regal rights which they had exercised, and a recognition of the validity of all the usages which prevailed among them. It was an acknowledgment of their independence by their ancient sovereign, who had not yet renounced every shadow of right to the sovereignty of Europe. Considering the effects of such concessions to the inhabitants of town, on the general opinion respecting that class, the day of the signature of the edict of Constance may be numbered among the most remarkable epochs in the long progress of human society. His career was closed at the head of 150,000 men, whom he led to the Holy Land to recover Jerusalem from the hands of Saladin, who had lately subdued it. After enduring many of the hardships of a crusade, he vanquished all the enemies whom he met: the way was open to Syria; and Saladin himself declared, that "he should leave it to the emperor and the princes to decide how much territory he might rightfully retain." As the army marched from Seleucia, in Cilicia, on the 10th of June, 1190, the emperor arriving on the banks of a small river called Salef (the ancient Callicadnus,) saw his army and baggage crossing it by a bridge so narrow, that to have waited till it was opened for him would have cost more time than he had the patience to sacrifice; he plunged to swim over the river on horseback; the stream was impetuous; it carried his horse away; and when the body of the emperor was brought on shore life had departed from it.

"The death of Frederick was bewailed," says the eloquent historian of the Italian republics, 'by the cities on which he had inflicted severe vengeance.' His army loudly deplored the loss of a sovereign, a general, a father.

"In the Italian wars of Frederick some of those intricate combinations occurred which perplex the judgment, and distract even the wishes of the spectator. In his labours to re-establish in Germany an order long unknown, he treated the princes of the empire arbitrarily, and appeared to exert an absolute power, which he believed himself to inherit from Constantine and Charlemagne. In Italy, accidental circumstances made him, at the same time, the enemy of the pope and of the republican cities. Piety and freedom are natural allies; but in his reign was first seen the rare union of ecclesiastical power with civil liberty. Hence arose parties which tore Italy in pieces for ages. The origin of the famous names of Guelphs and Ghibelines is singular. A battle was fought in Suabia, in December, 1140, by



the generals of the emperor Conrad of Hohenstaufen (a family which had only emerged from obscurity within a century,) against Welf or Guelf, duke of Bavaria, a member of a house which traced their pedigree, by the light of history, to the reign of Charlemagne, and fancied that they saw it through the mist of legends, as far as the invasion of Attila. At this battle the cry of the imperialists was *Waiblingen*, a village belonging to their master, where they had been quartered. That of the opposite army was *Welf*, the illustrious name of their leader. Hence Ghibeline, a corruption of Waiblingen, came in Germany to signify an imperialist, and Welf, or Guelph, an adherent to the great vassals of the empire, at the head of whom were the Guelphs. In Italy Ghibeline retained its old sense, as a partisan of the emperor. Guelph naturally slid into the signification of a partisan of the pope, the principal enemy of the emperor. The coincidence of interest and enmity which united the pope with the republican cities, gave to this latter word some tinge of the more generous character of a lover of liberty. Both these names long survived their early significations, or were too slightly connected with them to justify the further prosecution of inquiry into their history."

After a "pretty romance" from John of Brompton, respecting the birth and parentage of Thomas-à-Becket, the following account is given of his progress; and his first quarrel with Henry, the invader of Ireland:—

"He appears to have been originally made provost of Beverley, before Theobald had prevailed on the king to make him archdeacon of Canterbury, and subsequently chancellor. His manners and occupations, his pursuits, his amusements, were eminently worldly. When Henry told him, that he was to be archbishop of Canterbury, he smiled at the metamorphosis: when spoken to more earnestly, he appears to have agreed with all other men in thinking, that the choice could only have arisen from Henry's confidence in him as a blind instrument in his expected contests with the church. Honour alone was, perhaps, enough to call up a sudden blush at so degrading a reliance. 'Do not appoint me, sir, I entreat you. You place me in the only office in which I may be obliged no longer to be your friend.' Thus far his deportment was manly: what followed is more ambiguous. He immediately dismissed his splendid train, cast off his magnificent apparel, abandoned sports and revels, and lived with fewer attendants, coarser clothes, and scantier food, than suited the dignity of his station. That extraordinary changes suddenly manifest themselves, especially in a lofty and susceptible spirit like that of Becket, is certainly true; and it is evident, on a merely human view of the subject, that personal honour might have quickly revived the sense of professional decorum, and led rapidly to the simple conclusion, that the only sure way of appearing to be good is by being so in truth. A man of decisive character might seek to secure himself from relapse by flying to the opposite extreme in his outward deportment. It is not to be certainly pronounced, that either the subsequent violence of his policy, or the gross inconsistency of some parts of his conduct with his professions, decisively excludes the milder construction of his motives. Moderation is the best pledge of sincerity; but excess is no positive proof of hypocrisy. Though those who suddenly change the whole system of their conduct have most need of candour, they are by no means at all times the foremost to practise it. But the conduct of Becket has too much the appearance of being the policy of a man who foresaw that he was about to carry on war, as the leader of a religious party; and that it was necessary for him to assume that ostentation of sternness, and display of austerity, which the leaders of such parties have ever found to be the most effectual means of securing the attachment of the people, and of inflaming their passions against the common enemy. Religion might even acquire a place in his mind which she had not before; but it was so alloyed by worldly passions, that it is impossible for us to trust on any occasion to the purity of his motives. The common objects of vulgar ambition were undoubtedly sacrificed by Becket. He lost high office and unbounded favour. He preferred to them dominion over the minds of men, and the applause of the whole lettered part of Europe.

"In the year 1163, the hostilities between church and state began. Many instances of the most scandalous impunity of atrocious crimes, perpetrated by ecclesiastics, had lately occurred. The king, incensed by these examples, which he justly imputed to the exemption of the clergy from trial before the secular courts, while the ecclesiastical tribunals to whom they were subject had no power to inflict

capital, or indeed, any adequate punishment, called together a great council at Westminster, and required the bishops to renounce for their clergy an impunity as dishonourable to themselves as inconsistent with order and law. He required that every clerk taken in the act of committing an enormous crime, who was convicted of it, or had confessed it, should be degraded and forthwith delivered over to secular officers for the purpose of condign punishment. Finding it difficult to obtain this moderate demand, he tried to obtain the same object in less offensive language. He asked if they were ready to observe the customs and prerogatives of Henry I. ? The archbishop answered, "Yes; saving the rights and privileges of their order;" one of those reservations which seem specious till it be discovered that they destroy the concession to which they are annexed. The king left them with just displeasure: they followed him to Woodstock, where they assented to the demand without any saving of the rights of their order. The archbishop was not persuaded to follow his brethren till the last moment.

"Henry then called a general council at Clarendon, about the end of January, 1164, to give the form of law and the weight of national assent to the moderate concessions which the clergy had made to good order and public justice.

"The assembly at Clarendon seems to have been the most considerable of those which met under the title of the Great or Common Council of the Realm since the Norman invasion. They were not yet called by the name of a parliament. But whatever difficulty may exist concerning the qualifications of their constituent members, there is no reason to doubt that the fulness of legislative authority was exercised by the king only when he was present in such national assemblies, and acted with their advice and consent. The king made his propositions to the parliament in the form most inoffensive to the church, as a recognition and affirmation of the customs and liberties observed in the time of his predecessors, especially of the late king; which, however disregarded in practice, yet by force of the comprehensive clause restoring the Saxon laws might be easily made to extend to the concessions he had required from the clergy. These usages were contained in sixteen articles; of which the principal were, That all clerks summoned to answer for a crime should come before the king's justices; that if they were convicted, or had confessed, the church was no longer to protect them; that no ecclesiastical person should quit the realm without the king's license, and that they should find security, if the king required it, not to delay in going or returning; that all causes not ecclesiastical should be finally determined in the king's courts; and that no ecclesiastical appeals should proceed beyond the archbishop's court without the king's assent; that all ecclesiastical persons who are tenants of the crown *in capite* shall follow the king's customs, sue and be sued respecting their fiefs before his justices, and attend like other barons at his courts till judgment of life or limb shall be necessary; that vacant dignities in the church shall be in the king's hands; that he shall receive the profits as his senorial dues; that when the king provides for the vacancy, the election shall be made in his presence, and with his assent, and that the person elected shall take the oath of homage and fealty to the king as his liege lord. "Thus," says an ancient historian, whose professional prejudices seem on this occasion to have subdued his independent spirit, "was lay authority over all ecclesiastical persons or things, and the contempt of ecclesiastical law established amidst the murmurs of the bishops, but without resistance from them." Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, full of contrition for apparent acquiescence, however excused by fear and danger, openly did penance for his culpable weakness. He attempted to escape into France; but he was arrested at Romney for an offence against the constitutions of Clarendon. Having for a time administered the royal demesnes of Eye and Berkhamstead, he was summoned to account for rents and profits before a great council holden at Northampton. He pleaded a release by Henry the king's son, which was over-ruled justly, though the suit was intended only as a measure of war against him. When sentence was pronounced by the bishops and barons, he lifted up the cross which he held in his hand, and with his eyes fixed on it, slowly walked out of the court. In the ensuing night he found means to leave the town; and hiding himself during the day, he reached, by nocturnal journeys, the port of Sandwich, from which a small bark conveyed him to Flanders, where he went to pay his homage to the pope, who was then at Sens, and by whose influence he obtained an honourable and secure asylum in the splendid abbey of Pontigny, in Burgundy."

We shall conclude with a long and highly interesting passage, touching chivalry, the crusades, and the lion-hearted Richard.

" Chivalry is composed of the feelings and manners of the feudal system. It naturally happened, that the military tenants of the crown who served on horseback, and composed the main strength of a feudal army, had a plan of training for their youth, and formalities by which they were admitted to serve with their seniors. Hence the outward and mechanical modes of conferring knighthood: hence the fraternities of knights, some independent, most of them founded and patronised by princes, who afterwards arose. Among the smaller circumstances in the exterior of the system of feudality and chivalry were hereditary surnames and armorial bearings; usages to which some tendency may be traced among many nations: but which were most natural and necessary where the vassals of each lord formed a sort of separate people; became more than commonly indispensable where all military commands depended on the distinction and array of communities and tribes, acting together by visible signs and short names, as in the crusades; which were not only the main scene on which the power of chivalry was displayed, but the school where its usages were taught most effectually, and spread through a wider circle. It is one of the most curious facts in literary history, that the writers of the romances of chivalry are almost unknown to us by name, and that these romances themselves, once the sole reading of Europe, have almost wholly perished. Most readers, perhaps, now best know the peculiarities of the chivalrous code from the immortal romance which was written to expose them; but which, as under the form of a satire against one transient folly, it ridicules all injudicious and extravagant attempts to serve mankind, has survived the remembrance of the particular fooleries lashed by it, and will endure as long as it is beneficial to turn goodness to the choice of wise means, and to the pursuit of attainable ends.

" Scarcely had Richard taken up the cross, than his admirers afforded a very notable specimen of the mischievous inequality of chivalrous ethics. Zeal against the enemies of religion, rekindled by every new crusade, burst out on the very day of his coronation with unbridled fury on the branded and proscribed Hebrews. The king had on the day before issued a proclamation forbidding Jews and women to be present at Westminster, lest he might suffer from their magical arts. A few, however, eager to offer to a new ruler the gifts and congratulation of an afflicted people in a strange land, on a day of general grace and joy, according to the immemorial usage of the East, forced their way into the hall with the rest of the people, and were permitted to lay their presents before him with their humble suit for the continuance of that connivance at their residence, and of that precarious exemption from plunder and slaughter which they had obtained from his predecessors, on account of the money which might be wrung from them, of the useful council in finance which they might give to ignorant swordsmen, and of the ornaments and luxuries which they drew from remote lands, through the thousand channels of their subterranean intercourse with their unhappy and industrious brethren. A Christian struck a Jew entering at the gate. The courtiers either catching the contagion of the quarrel, or tempted by the sight of the brilliant presents, or hoping to cancel their debts with the blood of their creditors, fell on all the wealthy Jews, and beating and pillaging them, drove them out of the hall. The example of this violence at court spread over the city. The populace of London, and the multitude who had flocked from the country to see the coronation, easily believing the rumour, that the king had ordered the extermination of the miscreants, attacked and murdered the defenceless Jews, women and children, the old as well as the robust, with unrelenting rage. The Jewish families who barricaded their houses were generally burnt to death in their flames; wherever walls were too strong, burning wood was thrown in at the doors and windows. The rabble sometimes forced their way into the private apartments, and threw the feeble, the sick, and the dying, into the fires which they had kindled in the streets. The example was followed in many of the principal towns, and the massacre was renewed in two years afterwards. At York the Jews took refuge in the castle, after having seen many of their wives and children butchered before their eyes, and all who refused to be baptized massacred without mercy. The governor, who happened to be absent from the fortress, demanded admission into it; when the unhappy Jews, afraid of the forcible entry of the rabble, excused their disobedience. He inveighed against them with loud transports of rage. He even directed the castle to be attacked. The people seized the fatal word, which the governor vainly attempted to recall. Immense multitudes be-

sieged the castle for several days, stimulated by some ecclesiastics, and especially by one furious monk, who perpetually exhorted the people to destroy the enemies of Christ. On the night before the expected assault a rabbi, lately arrived from the Hebrew schools abroad, addressed his assembled countrymen:—‘Men of Israel, God commands us to die for his law, as our glorious forefathers have done in all ages. If we fall into the hands of our enemies they may cruelly torment us. That life which our Creator gave us, let us return to Him willingly and devoutly with our own hands.’ The majority applauded; a few only dissented. They burnt their costly garments, and destroyed their precious stones and vessels. They set fire to the building, and then Jocen, the most wealthy man among them, cut the throat of his wife. When all the women were sacrificed, he, as the most honourable, first destroyed himself. The rest followed his example. The few who shrunk from their brethren appeared in the morning pale and trembling to the people, who cruelly put them to death. The bonds of Christian debtors to Jews were taken from safe custody to the cathedral, where they were deposited, and instantly committed in a mass to the flames. It is a consolation to find, that Ralph Glanville, the first English lawyer, was employed by the king to quell this sedition. That he miserably failed may be concluded from the number of three who suffered death for this dreadful butchery, and from the reasons assigned for the selection of these three to be examples. One was executed because he had stolen the goods of a Christian; two others, because the flames which they had lighted in the houses of the Jews had spread to the dwellings of Christians.

“About the end of June, 1190, not many days after the crusade had suffered the irreparable loss of Frederick Barbarossa, on the frontiers of Syria, Philip Augustus and Richard reviewed together, at Vezelai, their magnificent and formidable host. Among the countless multitude of armed pilgrims who were scattered over the surrounding hills and valleys, the French bore red crosses, the English white, the Flemings green. Severe regulations were published against desertion, theft, murder, gambling, dresses unbecoming a religious enterprise, female companions, against trading in or near the camp, against a greater profit than ten by the hundred, and against the sale of bread otherwise than by the penny for equal weights, and directing the English penny to be equal in the exchange to four of the pence of Anjou. The French reached Messina on the 16th of September, the English six days afterwards. Here the seeds of disunion between Philip and Richard began to spring up visibly, in the midst of friendly festivity. Richard having been set free from his espousals to a French princess, despatched his aged mother to bring to him the princess-Berengaria of Navarre, of whom he had long been enamoured. His time there was occupied in warm disputes with Tancred, who had usurped or assumed the Sicilian crown, at the death of William II., a short time before, and imprisoned Joan of England, that prince’s widow. These differences terminated in an agreement that Tancred should pay twenty thousand ounces of gold to Richard, in consideration of which the latter renounced his own and his sister’s claims to the island, entered into an alliance with Tancred, and promised that his nephew and heir Arthur should espouse the daughter of that prince.

“Richard sailed from Messina on the 10th of April, 1191, after lingering there for more than six months. His fleet, of fifty-five galleys and one hundred and fifty ships, was dispersed by storm. The ship which conveyed his sister Joan, and Berengaria his espoused, (his mother had returned from her venturous expedition,) was compelled to seek refuge in a port of Cyprus, then governed by Isaac Comnenus, who held it out against the court of Constantinople, by the favour of Saladin, and now received the royal ladies with discourtesy.

“Richard, as if roving in quest of adventures, landed his whole army to chastise the apostate chief. Several rulers of Palestine came to Cyprus to entreat the speedy help of the chivalrous king. He took advantage of their presence to solemnise his nuptials with Berengaria, on the 12th of May, with the splendour which the occasion demanded. In spite of all expostulation he remained till the whole island was reduced. He had promised not to fetter Comnenus; but he pretended that he meant to exclude only iron fetters, and put him into silver chains. In June, 1191, he at last sailed to Tyre, where he found the Christians of Palestine divided between competitors to the crown of Jerusalem,—Gui de Lusignan and Conrad Marquis of Montferrat. In sailing along the coast of Syria to the siege of Acre, he met an enormous vessel, pretending to be French, but in truth Saracen, and intending to throw a considerable reinforcement into the besieged town. An obsti-

nate engagement ensued, in which the strange vessel was sunk, as the English tell us, by their prowess, according to the Mahometan writers by the unconquerable spirit of her ship's company.

"A curious journal of the siege of Acre is preserved by an ancient historian, [Hovenden], probably the work of an eye-witness, and remarkable for the distinctness which belongs to such narratives. Reduced, according to the Mussulman historians, to famine by the maritime blockade, the leaders of the garrison were compelled at length to negotiate for a capitulation. They desired to leave the town with their arms and goods. Richard cried out, 'No! after so long and such great exertions we must win something more than an empty town.' The Turks proposed 'that the garrison were to march out freely, leaving property and weapons behind.' Saladin agreed to release 2500 Christian prisoners, and, in two months, to pay 20,000 byzants as the ransom of the Turkish prisoners, and to restore the holy cross. A Christian eye-witness says, that such was the courage and virtue shown by the garrison, that no man could surpass them if their faith had been pure.

"On the 12th of July, 1191, the Christians entered Acre. The two kings divided the town, the prisoners, and other booty between them. Each of them planted the royal standard in his own portion; Leopold Duke of Austria made the like attempt. Richard's officers said to Leopold, 'Do you, a mere duke, pretend to be on a footing with kings?—' I fight,' he answered, 'I make war, by my own power and sovereignty, and, under God, I acknowledge no superior but St. Peter.' The duke left the town treasuring up his revenge for a favourable opportunity.

"The way was now open to Jerusalem. Philip demanded a moiety of Cyprus in virtue of a treaty which had stipulated the equal division of conquests. Richard observed that the treaty provided only for conquests made from the Turks. It was agreed to confine it to acquisitions in Syria and Palestine. But all these both the competitors for the throne of Jerusalem claimed as justly belonging to that crown. A warm contest for the kingdom arose between Richard, who supported Lusignan, his vassal in Poitou, with the help of the Pisans and Venetians, and Philip, who maintained with equal zeal the claims of his relation Conrad, which were also espoused by the Genoese. Philip was desirous of immediate peace on moderate conditions. Richard took fire at so base a compromise. A secret understanding with Saladin, the heaviest imputation on the chief of a crusade, was laid to Philip's charge. Perhaps he was influenced by views, hitherto almost a secret to himself, on the territories of his great vassal. He proclaimed the crusade to be ended, and declared his determination immediately to return to France. 'If Philip think,' said Richard, 'that a long residence here will be fatal to him, let him go and cover his kingdom with shame.'

"Philip, however, quieted Richard, by swearing that he would attack neither Richard's possessions nor those of any other prince who remained in Syria, but rather protect them with all his might. In the beginning of August, 1191, he sailed from Syria, was released from his oath by pope Celestine II. at Rome, and before the end of the year reached his capital city.

"Saladin evaded or delayed the first instalments of the ransom. Richard enforced it in a manner even then deemed ferocious. On the 15th of August, the day on which he and his army celebrated the assumption of the blessed Virgin, he commanded two thousand five hundred of the gallant garrison of Acre to be led out into a meadow under the walls of that city, and there, without exception or discrimination, to be put to the sword. 'We have, as became us,' says Richard in a letter to the abbot of Clairvaux, 'put to death two thousand five hundred of them.' 'It was done,' says an ancient writer, 'with the assent of all.' No danger from the prisoners was alleged as an excuse. With a superstition equally cruel and fierce, the Christians searched the carcasses of the murdered Turks for golden byzants, and converted the gall which was found in their dead bodies into medicines. Never was a siege so fatal as that of Acre. Six archbishops, twelve bishops, forty counts, five hundred men of noble birth, perished before it or in it. Of three hundred thousand pilgrims only six thousand lived to see their home.

"On the 24th of August, 1191, the camp was broken up, and Richard had scarce marched a day's journey, when the Turks showed themselves on every side. When the army encamped, the heralds went around crying, 'God help the holy sepulchre!' and the body of pilgrims loudly repeated the prayer three times. The march was tremendous. The Mahometans, incensed at the murder of their brethren, planted the ground, where they knew the enemy must encamp, with knives

and the like instruments, which wounded the horses and brought the knights to the grounds. Marching through the Syrian desert at the season when the sun shoots his fiercest heat, Richard's soldiers were faint with hunger and maddened by thirst. Immediate death by any of these means was the envied lot of only a small number. The cries, the uncouth appearance, and fierce visages of the Bedouins, increased the horror. A few negroes used by Saladin more for state than strength, a race, perhaps, less cruel than any other tribes not softened by religion and law, appalled the ignorant Europeans, as, in the language of the eye-witness, 'a ghastly race, fitly called negroes from their extreme blackness.' For two miles round nothing was to be seen but the Turkish army, terribly armed and beautifully arrayed, except where there were interspersed bands of such savage auxiliaries.

"The Europeans, thus surrounded, were compelled, on the 7th of September, to fight their way through the enemy with great loss and difficulty, which they called a victory. On one occasion Richard was preserved from death or a prison, on a hawking party, and by the generosity of William de Preaux, who, pointing to himself, called out in Arabic, that he was the *malik* or king. These examples of the miseries of a crusade are sufficient. Discord and mutiny always break out among suffering armies under unfortunate commanders. In the repairs of Ascalon, where all were to lend a hand, Leopold duke of Austria sullenly said to Richard, 'My father was not a mason, and I was not bred a carpenter.' The king is said to have kicked the duke.

"In April, 1192, the news of the revolt and confusion in England began to remind him of the necessity of returning to his country. He at length yielded to the general desire of bestowing the nominal crown of Jerusalem on the marquis of Montferrat. On returning to his house from a feast given to celebrate his election, that prince found two youths standing at his door; one of them put a letter into his hands and stabbed him mortally with a dagger, crying out, exultingly,—'Thou shalt neither be a marquis nor a king.' It is agreed on all hands that these youths were the followers of a sheik, from the dire and devoted fanaticism of whose disciples the name *assassin* has been adopted in most languages of Europe. Rumour appears very early to have charged Richard with being the instigator of this murder. The suspicion is chiefly countenanced by no other person being mentioned who had any motive to destroy Guy. Yet the fanatics were probably more likely to be impelled to the deed by enthusiastic hatred of a new Christian king, than to be allured to it by the practices or promises of another unbelieving sovereign. The nature of Richard's vices also affords him a defence which it would have been vain to seek in his few virtues. He was too inconsiderate for contriving plots, and too impatient to wait till the whole web was woven. The ostentation of power formed with him so large a portion of vindictive gratification, that he does not seem likely to stoop to secret revenge. A murder to remove a formidable foe he might, perhaps, have endured without showing the strength of his arm; but a murder to chastise an offensive enemy, when the offence was publicly pardoned, has the humiliating confession of an appearance of weakness to which the pleasure of guilt could scarcely have reconciled him. His humanity would have been a feeble security to any offence. But his pride and his indiscretion disqualified, and probably indisposed, him for playing the part of an assassin."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Richard, who was as well pleased to bestow as to win kingdoms, conferred that of Cyprus on Gui de Lusignan, whose posterity enjoyed it for two centuries. Stern as he was he shed bitter tears at being prevented by illness from visiting Jerusalem with the other pilgrims, and declared his determination to return speedily, that he might perform his vows at the Holy Sepulchre. Had he remained in the East six months longer, he might have absolved himself of his vows more easily and speedily than he hoped; for on the 4th of March, 1193, Saladin expired, in the fifty-seventh year of his age, leaving behind him the just reputation of the most upright and wisest prince who ever filled a Mussulman throne. He had risen to be sovereign of Asia, from the station of a private Curdish soldier, by the general Mahometan title of the sword. 'Go,' said he to his standard-bearer, as death was fast approaching, 'show this flag of the dead to the army, and tell them that the lord of the East could bring nothing but a single garment to the grave.'—'Honour the greatest of Beings,' said he to his son, 'and obey his commandments; for he is the root of good, and in him is all our weal. Spill no blood: for it will one day reach thy head. Preserve the hearts of thy subjects by loving care; for they are entrusted to thee by God. Hate no one; for all are your fellow-mortals. If thou hast offended against God, repent; for he is of great mercy.'"